

Trade Organization, and for other purposes.

S. 240

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the names of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRIST] were added as cosponsors of S. 240, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to establish a filing deadline and to provide certain safeguards to ensure that the interests of investors are well protected under the implied private action provisions of the act.

S. 388

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 388, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to eliminate the penalties for noncompliance by States with a program requiring the use of motorcycle helmets, and for other purposes.

S. 391

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the names of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYL] were added as cosponsors of S. 391, a bill to authorize and direct the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to undertake activities to halt and reverse the decline in forest health on Federal lands, and for other purposes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 92—AMENDING RULE XXV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Mr. DOLE submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 92

Resolved, That Rule XXV, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended as follows:

Strike the figure after "Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry" and insert in lieu thereof "18".

Strike the figure after "Energy and Natural Resources" and insert in lieu thereof "20".

SEC. 2. That Rule XXV, paragraph 3(c) of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended as follows:

Strike the figure after "Indian Affairs" and insert in lieu thereof "16".

SENATE RESOLUTION 93—MAKING MAJORITY PARTY APPOINTMENTS TO SENATE COMMITTEES

Mr. DOLE submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 93

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the majority party's membership on the following Senate committees for the 104th Congress, or until their successors are appointed:

Energy and Natural Resources: Mr. Murkowski (Chairman), Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Domenici, Mr. Nickles, Mr. Craig, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Kyl, Mr. Grams, Mr. Jeffords, and Mr. Burns.

Veterans' Affairs: Mr. Simpson (Chairman), Mr. Murkowski, Mr. Specter, Mr.

Thurmond, Mr. Jeffords, Mr. Campbell, and Mr. Craig.

Indian Affairs: Mr. McCain (Chairman), Mr. Murkowski, Mr. Gorton, Mr. Domenici, Mrs. Kassebaum, Mr. Nickles, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Thomas, and Mr. Hatch.

SENATE RESOLUTION 94—MAKING A MAJORITY PARTY APPOINTMENT

Mr. DOLE submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 94

Resolved, That the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Campbell) is hereby appointed to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry, and that the following be the majority membership on that committee for the 104th Congress, or until their successors are appointed:

Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry: Mr. Lugar (Chairman), Mr. Dole, Mr. Helms, Mr. Cochran, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Craig, Mr. Coverdell, Mr. Santorum, Mr. Warner, and Mr. Campbell.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on the Constitution, Federalism, and Property Rights of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, be authorized to meet during a session of the Senate on Friday, March 24, 1995, at 9 a.m., in Senate Dirksen Room 226, on "The 10th Amendment and the Conference of the States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE LINE-ITEM VETO

• Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, it was with the greatest of enthusiasm that I chose to support the line-item veto legislation.

In just a few weeks, all of us will be asked to cast our votes to raise the debt ceiling for this country to more than \$5 trillion. It is difficult to comprehend the enormity of this figure. If you took those 5 trillion individual dollars and laid them end to end, they would span the vast icy distance between the Earth and Moon almost 2,000 times.

The line-item veto represents a small but most significant first step toward processes to ensure greater fiscal responsibility. I believe the measure that we recently passed is the best workable compromise between various approaches and will make this legislation very effective. I am particularly pleased by the inclusion of a "lockbox" provision to ensure that any spending that is "zeroed out" is earmarked for deficit reduction.

Our past experience with spending patterns here in Congress demonstrates why it was crucial to include this pro-

vision. I have seen a number of programs terminated on the Senate floor, after hours of spirited debate centered around the question—"can we afford it"? After concluding that we could not afford the program in question, we terminated the program, then failed to adjust the spending caps downward, meaning that we simply spent the money on something else. Such a "loophole" in this legislation would be a costly and destructive provision that would make a mockery of this measure. Without the lockbox provision the President could terminate a program with an eye toward seeing those funds reprogrammed in another direction. Or, Congress could simply retitle or reallocate the funding items which failed to pass muster. That would subvert the clear intention of this sharpened tool, which is to enable the President to assist in slowing down and reducing Government spending.

What pleases me the most about this legislation is that its modified form will permit the President to confront the problem of rising entitlement spending. This is, as we well know, the fastest growing category of Federal spending, and the single greatest cause of runaway debt. In the past, one over-used tactic used to evade the discipline of discretionary spending caps has been to promote new programs in the form of mandatory entitlements. This designation has shielded them from annual scrutiny through the appropriations process and creates an ever expanding "black hole" into which our Federal dollars disappear. Giving the President a chance to ward off future trespasses in area will make this legislation much more effective in controlling spending.

Opponents of this measure have criticized the line-item veto on the basis of or experience with it at the State level. Sometimes they say that such authority is not easily applied at the Federal level, or worse yet, that it does not even work in the States. The latter contention is simply flat-out wrong. The line-item veto does work effectively at the State level. We heard testimony to that effect in the Judiciary Committee, where we learned of countless instances in which governors have used the power to eliminate wasteful spending from appropriations bills. It is one reason why no State has a fiscal crisis on the order of compare to our Federal deficit.

I fully understand the sincerity of opponents of this measure when they voice fears that the line-item veto would give too much power to the President. The allegation has been made that the President could use this power to punish individual legislators, indeed to carry out a personal vendetta against a particular Congressman or Senator. I simply believe that due reflection on this matter will show that there is little to fear from such a situation occurring. First of all, these vetoes will not be made in secret. The press will eagerly report on the items